REMARKS

Claims 23-44 are pending in the application. Claims 23, 27, 32 and 39 are amended with this response. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 23-26 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 23-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,512,617 (Tanji et al.). Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

i. Tanji et al. do not teach a multiplexing device connected to a signal input comprising an external connecting pin that is configured to pass an input signal from the signal input to the control device or the driver, as recited in claim 23.

Claim 23 is directed to an optical transmission module. The module comprises an optical transmission element, a driver, and a control device. ***The module further comprises a multiplexer that selectively passes an input signal at its signal input that comprises an external connecting pin to either the driver or the control device.*** More particularly, the multiplexer passes the input signal from the signal input to the driver during the transmission mode, and ***from the same signal input*** to the control device in the program mode. Therefore the input signal at the external connecting pin is one of a programming signal or a drive signal, and the multiplexer is configured to take the signal at that input and selectively pass it to one of the driver and the control device based on the type of signal at the input.

Tanji et al. differs from the invention of claim 23 in that the optical transceiver of ***Tanji et al. does not use the same external connecting pin for receiving both drive (or transmission) signals and programming signals.*** More particularly, as illustrated in Fig. 1 and discussed in Col. 3, lines 55-62 of the cited reference, Tanji et al. disclose a block 35 that selectively passes signals provided by four physically distinct, separate

signal inputs (40, 45, 50, 55). As described in Tanji et al., if a calibration (programming) mode is entered, the block 35 disables the data input/output lines 55, 40. Those data lines, in stark contrast to the invention of claim 23, are provided on input lines that are separate and distinct from the programming lines. Consequently, the multiplexer (block 35) of Tanji et al. is configured and operates differently than the invention of claim 23, and therefore claim 23 is not anticipated by the cited prior art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 37-38 AND 41-44 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 37-38 and 41-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanji et al. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

As highlighted above, Tanji et al. do not teach the invention of claim 23. Claims 37-38 and 41-44 each depend indirectly on claim 23, and provide further limitations thereto. Therefore claims 37-38 and 41-44 are patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, the claims currently under consideration are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should any fees be due as a result of the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the Deposit Account Number 50-1733, MAIKP137US.

Respectfully submitted,

ESCHWEILER & ASSOCIATES, LLC

/Thomas G. Eschweiler/
Thomas G. Eschweiler
Reg. No. 36,981

National City Bank Building
629 Euclid Avenue, Suite 1000
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 502-0600